

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 2, 3, 5, 8 and 9. The first replacement sheet includes Fig. 2 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 2. The second replacement sheet includes Fig. 3 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3. The third replacement sheet, which includes Figs. 5-7, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 5-7. The fourth replacement sheet includes Fig. 8 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 8. The fifth replacement sheet, which includes Figs. 9 and 10, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 9 and 10. Changes incorporated in this sheet are indicated in red on the attached annotated copy of the original sheet.

Attachments: Five Replacement Sheets

Annotated Copies of Original Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 6 are amended. The specification and drawings are also amended. No new subject matter is believed to have been added by these amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has acknowledged that claims 1-9 are directed to allowable subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and claims 2-9 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Specification and Abstract Objections

The specification and abstract stand objected to for informalities. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the specification and abstract for including the use of the same term for multiple reference numbers because the use of the same term for multiple reference numbers leaves unclear in the claims which reference number corresponds to the term. In response to this objection, the specification has been amended to more clearly set forth the present invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The specification is further objected to due to inconsistencies in nomenclature. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the labeling of “concavity” and “socket” as 811. The specification has been amended to indicate that concavity and socket can be used interchangeably. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Finally, the specification has been objected because the first and second axes described therein lack a corresponding reference character. The specification and drawings have been amended to include reference characters directed to both a first axis and second axis. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Drawing Objections

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference sign 835 not mentioned in the description. The specification has been amended to include reference sign 835.

The drawings further stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to show every feature of the invention as claimed. Specifically, the Examiner indicates that the first and second axes as recited in claim 1 must be shown in the figures. The Applicant believes that amended Figures 2, 3, 5, 8 and 9 overcome the Examiner's objections. Amendments to Figures 2, 3, 5, 8 and 9 are indicated in red in the attached annotated copy of Figures 2, 3, 5, 8 and 9.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-8 stand objected to for informalities. Specifically, the Examiner has objected to the recitation of both socket and concavity because both terms refer to reference number 811. The Examiner further objected to claim 6 because he believed that the phrase "so as to help bracing up" was awkward. The Applicant believes that the above amendments to claims 1 and 6, as well as the amendments to the specification and drawings, overcome the Examiner's informality objections.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Specifically, the Examiner has rejected the claims as being unclear because several terms in the claims are associated with multiple reference numbers in the specification, thus leaving unclear what specific structure is being claimed. The Applicant believes that the above amendments to claims 1, as well as the amendments to the specification and drawings, overcome this rejection. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to include language describing that the left and right frame units include three parts and that at least one of the three parts comprises an anchored coupler, an anchoring coupler, a locking unit, a linking lever and a linkage. Therefore, since the inventive concept in this application is embodied in three different frame parts in the one and the same structure of a foldable stroller, i.e., the first part 8, the second part 65, and the third part 3 (please refer to Fig. 1 for a general construction, and refer to Figs. 3, 5 and 9 for the respective detailed structures), the Applicant believes that placing such language in claim 1 more clearly defines the invention and overcomes the Examiner's indefiniteness rejection.

The Examiner further rejected claims 1-9 because the terms "anchored region", "locking unit" and "channel" are not associated with a reference number. The Applicant disagrees with this rejection. Each of the above mentioned terms is clearly described in the specification. For instance, the anchored region is described in the paragraph beginning on page 5, lines 11, in the paragraph beginning on page 9, line 10. The locking unit is described in the paragraph beginning on page 5, line 24 and in the paragraph beginning on page 8, line 24. A channel is described in the paragraph beginning on page 7, line 4. Therefore, the nomenclature used in the claims is apparent from the specification and the specification provides clear antecedent basis for each of these terms.

The Examiner also rejects the claims due to the recitation of "first and second axes" not being clearly defined. The Applicant believes that the above amendments to the specification and drawings, which clearly define and illustrate the first and second axes, overcome the Examiner's indefiniteness rejections.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of pending claims 1-9 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM


By




Ryan J. Miller
Agent for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-1845
Telephone: 412-471-8815
Facsimile: 412-471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com



Shun-Min CHEN
FOLDABLE FRAME ASSEMBLY FOR A FOLDABLE STROLLER
Appl. No. 10/644,663 - Attorney Docket No. 0624-031636
ANNOTATED SHEET SHOWING CHANGES








FIG. 5




FIG. 6





FIG. 7






FIG. 9




FIG. 10